**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes (US Publication no. 2003/0208411) in view of Franklin (US Patent No. 6,125,352).

Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes and Franklin and Kirner (US Publication no. 2002/00446040).

Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes, Franklin and Iannacci (US Publication no. 2002/0062249).

The claims are amended, and, thus the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

The independent claims are 1, 6, 12, 17 and 23, which are rejected over Estes and Franklin. The rejection is traversed as follows:

According to an embodiment of the present invention, the correspondence relationship of an address ID and address information is dynamically changed. The Office Action Response to Arguments provides that the claims do not include a limitation relating to the feature of dynamically changing the correspondence between an address ID and address data. Amended claim 1 emphasizes "***generating, by a delivery company computer, a new~~respective~~ unique address identification (ID)*** … each time the purchaser requests to purchase and/or deliver merchandise, and/or according to a request for issuing a unique address ID from the purchaser computer, the unique address IDs being invulnerable to reverse translation by a third party into the address data."

The Office Action Response to Arguments also provides 'what advantage would entering in the address data each time have.' However, the language of claim 1 provides that "each time the purchaser requests to purchase and/or deliver merchandise" a unique address ID can be generated.

The Office Action Response to Arguments also provides that 'because a correspondence is never established, it is unclear how the actual correspondence changes.' However, the

language of claim 1 provides "managing a correspondence table indicating correspondence between the address data ... and the generated respective unique address IDs" and "***generating, by a delivery company computer, a new~~respective~~ unique address identification (ID)*** ... each time the purchaser requests to purchase and/or deliver merchandise, and/or according to a request for issuing a unique address ID from the purchaser computer," which achieves a benefit of dynamically changing the correspondence between an address ID and address data when a new address ID is generated each time the purchaser requests to purchase and/or deliver merchandise. For example, the present application page 15, lines 1-24 and page 18, line 16 to page 20, line 19 and FIGS. 4-8 support an embodiment of the present invention.

In both cited references, Estes and Franklin, the correspondence of address data and address ID are fixed. In particular, the Office Action relies upon Franklin's 'saving multiple addresses for one user,' however, the configuration of Franklin is for making easy search of address data, i.e., to easily search for a delivery address, by assigning a friendly nick name to a plurality of delivery addresses for a user (see relied upon Franklin column 23, line 61 to column 24, line 13). Accordingly, in Franklin, the correspondence of address data and address ID should be fixed to make browsing/searching of delivery addresses easy.

And there is no evidence, either expressly or implicitly, in Estes and Franklin that one skilled in the art would modify Franklin's easy delivery address search to provide the claimed "generating, by a delivery company computer, a new~~respective~~ unique address identification (ID) ... each time the purchaser requests to purchase and/or deliver merchandise, and/or according to a request for issuing a unique address ID from the purchaser computer, the unique address IDs being invulnerable to reverse translation by a third party into the address data," and seen a benefit of dynamically changing the correspondence between the generated address IDs and an actual address.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested. Independent claims 6, 12, 17 and 23 include limitations similar to the discussed amended limitations of claim 1.

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____March 24, 2010_____    By: _____
                                            Mehdi D. Sheikerz
                                            Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501